



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CU
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,285	08/31/2004	Rogier Johannes Braak	NL 020191	6783

24737 7590 04/26/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

ROY, SIKHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/506,285	Applicant(s) BRAAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Sikha Roy	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment, filed on February 14, 2007 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner

Addition of claims 7-20 has been entered.

In light of amendment the 35 U.S. C. 112 second paragraph rejection of claim 4 has been withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 14 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 5 'the electronic appliance' lacks antecedent basis as there is no mention of electrical appliance in claim 1. For continuing examination 'an electronic appliance' is considered.

Claim 14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 5. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim 15 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper

Art Unit: 2879

dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 15 depends on claim 6 which depends on claim 5, claim 5 recites the same limitation as of claim 15.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0230972 to Cok , and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,007,396 to Wisbey et al.

Regarding claim 1 Cok discloses (Fig. 2 para [0019]-[0021]) a display device comprising a polymer LED display comprising a geometrical arrangement of individually excitable polymer LEDs for forming image and comprising electrical connections (TFT active matrix layer), a light absorbing filter layer 40 covering the display.

Cok is silent about a semitransparent reflective layer covering the filter layer.

Wisbey in pertinent field of light emitting displays discloses (Fig. 6 column 2 lines 43-61) plurality of LED devices 10 mounted on a substrate 11 and a semitransparent reflective layer (aluminum film 12 evaporated under onto a glass cover 13) provided on the LED devices on the substrate. Wisbey teaches this configuration allows most of the

substrate to be obscured by the reflecting film and can be used to hide the bonding wires for driving LED devices.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the semi-transparent reflecting film on the cover the of the display device of Cok as disclosed by Wiseby for obscuring the electrical connections for driving the polymer LEDs. The recitation of 'for transmitting light emanating from the polymer LED display and for reflecting ambient light' has not been given patentable weight because is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claim 3 Cok discloses (para [0109]) the polymer LED display can be provided with an anti-glare or anti-reflection coating on the cover for enhancing optical effect.

Claims 1-4,7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0230972 to Cok , and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,871,982 to Holman et al.

Regarding claim 1 Cok discloses (Fig. 2 para [0019]-[0021]) a display device comprising a polymer LED display comprising a geometrical arrangement of individually excitable polymer LEDs for forming image and comprising electrical connections (TFT active matrix layer), a light absorbing filter layer 40 covering the display.

Art Unit: 2879

Cok is silent about a semitransparent reflective layer covering the filter layer.

Holman in relevant art of displays discloses (Fig. 1A column 12 lines 16-21) a reflective polarizer 28 added on top of the display for controlling polarization of the output light.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a semitransparent reflective layer (reflective polarizer) as taught by Holman on the display of Cok for controlling the polarization of the output light. The recitation of 'for transmitting light emanating from the polymer LED display and for reflecting ambient light' has not been given patentable weight because is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claim 2 Holman discloses the reflective layer is a reflective polarizer.

Regarding claim 3 Cok discloses (para [0109]) the polymer LED display can be provided with an anti-glare or anti-reflection coating on the cover for enhancing optical effect.

Regarding claim 4 Holman discloses (column 51 lines 59-64) linear polarizer including the dual brightness enhancement films (DBEF) which are the best commercially available reflective polarizers.

Regarding claim 7 Cok discloses (para [0109]) the polymer LED display can be provided with an anti-glare or anti-reflection coating on the cover for enhancing optical effect.

Regarding claims 8, 9 and 10 Holman discloses linear polarizer including the dual brightness enhancement films (DBEF) which are the best commercially available reflective polarizers.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0230972 to Cok , U.S. Patent 4,007,396 to Wisbey et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,362,566 to Xu et al.

Regarding claim 5 Cok and Wisbey disclose electronic display but do not exemplify an electronic appliance comprising the display.

Xu discloses (column 1 lines 27-35) OLED arrays capable of generating light under a variety of ambient sufficient light for use in displays can be fabricated in variety of sizes cheaply and their emissive operation provides a very wide viewing angle. Xu teaches that these displays are suitable choices for use in small electronic devices such as pagers, cellular and portable telephones.

Therefore it would have been obvious to use the display of Cok and Wisbey in electrical appliances as taught by Xu for generating light under a variety of ambient sufficient light and providing a wide viewing angle display.

Regarding claim 6 an electric shaver is a well known small portable electronic appliance with display equivalent to the ones mentioned by Xu and hence it would have

Art Unit: 2879

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display of Cok and Wisbey in an electric shaver.

Claims 11-13,16 –19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0230972 to Cok , U.S. Patent 6,871,982 to Holman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,362,566 to Xu et al.

Regarding claim 11 Cok and Holman disclose electronic display but do not exemplify an electronic appliance comprising the display.

Xu discloses (column 1 lines 27-35) OLED arrays capable of generating light under a variety of ambient sufficient light for use in displays can be fabricated in variety of sizes cheaply and their emissive operation provides a very wide viewing angle. Xu teaches that these displays are suitable choices for use in small electronic devices such as pagers, cellular and portable telephones.

Therefore it would have been obvious to use the display of Cok and Wisbey in electrical appliances as taught by Xu for generating light under a variety of ambient sufficient light and providing a wide viewing angle display.

Claims 12,13,16-19 essentially recite the same limitation as of claim 11 and hence are rejected for the same reason.

Regarding claim 20 an electric shaver is a well known small portable electronic appliance with display equivalent to the ones mentioned by Xu and hence it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display of Cok and Holman in an electric shaver.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879